

1
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7
8
9

10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11
12
13
14
15

RAHINAH IBRAHIM,

No. C 06-00545 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**REQUEST FOR BRIEFING
MEMORANDA**

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, et al.,

Defendants.

16
17 A "Court Information Officer" from Washington D.C. has contacted the clerk's office of
18 this district court concerning this case and wishes to travel to San Francisco to show certain
19 documents to the undersigned judge. Afterward, the officer intends to take the documents back
20 to Washington, apparently without disclosure of the documents to plaintiff or plaintiff's counsel,
21 and without leaving copies for the record.

22 The Court is unfamiliar with such a procedure and requests a memorandum from each
23 side concerning the purpose of any such in-camera disclosure as well as the extent to which
24 counsel (on both sides) should be permitted to view the documents. The memoranda should
25 quote from applicable statutes, regulations, and other legal authority. Be specific.

26 Government's counsel should instruct the officer mentioned *not* to visit the undersigned
27 judge until the Court has reviewed the memorandums and has settled on an appropriate
28 procedure. The memoranda are due **TUESDAY AT NOON**, and must be served on the other side.

1 Five-page replies may be submitted within 24 hours. No ex parte memoranda will be allowed
2 for this limited purpose. In the meantime, it will not be possible for the officer to visit the
3 undersigned. The officer has submitted national security guidelines ex parte but this will not be
4 reviewed until a proper procedure has been decided.

5 A discussion on this issue will be held at the case management conference on Thursday.
6

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 Dated: November 7, 2012.

10 
11 WILLIAM ALSUP
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE